UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,983	09/10/2003	Dale John Shidla	200310483-1	3966
	7590 08/12/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			DAVE, JYOTI D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/12/2008	ELECTRONIC

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/658,983	SHIDLA ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	•	JYOTI D. DAVE	2191		
	The MAILING DATE of this communication ag				
Period f	or Reply				
WHI0 - Exte after - If No - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 or SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu- reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili- ned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO ute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/9/	<u>/08</u> .			
2a)⊠	∑ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allow	ance except for formal mat	tters, prosecution as to the merits is		
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposit	tion of Claims				
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application	n.			
/—	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra				
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.				
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.			
Applicat	tion Papers				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.			
· ·	The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 September 2003</u> is		objected to by the Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeya	ınce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
- 12)□	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	ın priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
	)				
	1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in A	Application No		
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the price	ority documents have been	n received in this National Stage		
	application from the International Burea				
~ ;	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	t received.		
Attachmer	nt(s)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)		
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	<del></del> ·	(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application 		

Application/Control Number: 10/658,983 Page 2

Art Unit: 2191

#### DETAILED ACTION

## Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the reasons set forth below:

## Claims 1-3 and 18:

- Applicant contends that Metzger does not disclose "opportunistically scheduling a
  redundant operation on one of the functional units that would otherwise be idle during a
  cycle. However, Metzger discloses a function unit be detected as idle for a period of time
  exceeding a threshold. The threshold time can be interpreted to equal the time it takes for
  a cycle to finish.
- 2. Applicant contends Metzger does not disclose "redundant operations" scheduled that would otherwise be idle. However, the instructions are chose for appropriate registers. This can mean that the registers are specified for only certain functionality instructions, thus scheduling "redundant operations"
- 3. Applicant contends that Quach does not disclose opportunistically scheduling a redundant operation on one of the functional units that would otherwise be idle during a cycle. However, Examiner used the specific limitations disclosed in Quach, the "multiple functional units of a same type", to combine with the invention disclosed in Metzger. Therefore, as stated above, Meztger discloses an opportunistically scheduling a redundant operation on one of the functional units that would otherwise be idle during a cycle.

Art Unit: 2191

4. Applicant contends that neither Metzger or Quach disclose scheduling a comparison of results. However, Quach does disclose a comparison of results (see col. 6, lines 1-7, results generated by clusters [identical instructions] are compared by check unit and an error is indicated if results are different). Also, Raina discloses scheduling a comparison of results as stated in the 2/7/2007 Office Action in reference to claim 5-10 and 14-15.

## Claims 4-17:

Applicant contends that claims 4-17 are patentably distinguished over Metzger in view of
Quach for at least the reasons discussed in the Response to the Office Action dated
5/9/2008 in relation to claims 1 and 2. However, for the reasons stated above,
Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

Arguments made by Applicant have been considered. However, Examiner respectfully maintains the rejection.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendments necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/658,983 Page 4

Art Unit: 2191

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jyoti D. Dave whose telephone number is 571-270-1470. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5 PM Mon-Fri, Alt Fri. Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jyoti D Dave/ Examiner, Art Unit 2191 8/5/2008